



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The prophets beginning with Amos had forerunners—those who prepared the way. These were Samuel and the *nebhiim* of his day, Nathan, Ahijah, Micaiah, Elijah, and Elisha, with the hundreds of *nebhiim* in their day. These men did not write. They were preachers, and the prophets followed. They were pre-prophets. The work of Moses in a still earlier period, which briefly we may call Mosaism, passed into this pre-prophetism in the days of Samuel. Pre-prophetism, after two centuries of history, passed into prophetism, and still later prophetism, when its work was finished, finally passed into Judaism. The line is a long one. The marks of transition are not easy to be discovered, but the progress onward is as tangible as if it were presented in a panorama to the eye itself. And as the facts of history and the truth of revelation thus arrange themselves in orderly progress, we see new evidence of the presence of a guiding spirit, an all-controlling mind, an infinite Creator. Lines of separation are sometimes too closely drawn, but the distinction between pre-prophetism and prophetism, the former growing out of Mosaism, and the latter growing into Judaism, is a distinction which will help the earnest student to understand the divine wisdom shown in revelation.

AMOS AND HOSEA

Has it ever seemed quite true that a cold moralist might be as religious as an emotional mystic? Is the kingdom of God large enough perhaps to include men of both the types just mentioned? If we take the testimony of the moralist and accept his representations on the subject, we might be inclined to call the religious feeling, so warmly and tangibly expressed by the mystic, as nothing but emotionalism. This is a term not infrequently applied to it. On the other hand, if we take the testimony of the mystic and believe what he says about the moralist, the latter will be ruled out of the kingdom of God and designated a barbarian. But there has never been a time in history when men of both these types did not live and do good and serve God. For some men cold moralism is the only religion possible. Would you take it away from them? Is morality altogether of no value? For others emotion and tender regard for others are the expression of the religious feeling. Would you deprive them of the pleasure and the suffering which go therewith? Cannot

the great Father of humanity make good use of both types? Does he not do so? One has only to study the cases of Amos and Hosea to find the answer to this question. Amos was a silent, severe moralist, without religious feeling of any kind; one might almost say, without religion. His God was a deity of supreme righteousness and justice, one who could be satisfied only with a justice which corresponded to his own. This deity was one before whom all men should bow, who showed no special favor to any man, whose laws were universal, and before whom, as a righteous God, every nation must kneel. What this deity demanded was not worship of any kind—he had no care for that—but obedience and morality. On the other hand, Hosea knew Jehovah as a God of love, that is, grace; expecting for himself from man an attitude of love, that is, piety; and expecting also between man and man this same love, that is, humanity. Hosea was emotional in the extreme, full of mystic yearnings, even passionate in the expression of his feelings, whether they were those of love or hate. Hosea believed that Jehovah's love for his people involved directly or indirectly the rescue of that people from sin and suffering and shame. He did not know when or how this would come to pass; but God was love. And so great was this love—represented sometimes by the figure of the husband, and at others by the figure of the father—that it might at all events temper the sword of justice.

In other words, Amos and Hosea, living about the same time in Israel's history, represented the two types of religious life which have existed throughout all time and which make up our personal life. Is it possible that with the growing influence of scientific thought, and with the more general acceptance of the doctrine of universal law, the type of religion which Amos represents is today increasing at the expense of the other? We may not be certain about this; but let us assure ourselves of one thing: to recognize God as a ruler of the universe whose will is expressed in law, to demand justice and righteousness of the nation and of the individual, and to denounce immorality and oppression of every kind, is, after all, to do what Amos did. The pendulum swings to and fro. At times humanity passes through a period in which an Hosea more truly represents the life and thought than any other. Tenderness and patience, gentleness and love, visions of the world beyond, and a yielding to

the mystic influence of visions and dreams—this is the religious method. But in another generation or in another century it changes, and a rigid severity of life and thought becomes supreme. The key-notes of life are rectitude and truth, a living up to certain standards, even at the cost of happiness and life. Religion has among its votaries both classes. Religion stands in need of both classes; and if for a while one influence gains supremacy, a little later the other will rise to counterbalance and counteract. That these two types of religious life and character may live and work together is proved beyond all question by the scriptural testimony given in the work of Amos and Hosea. Is there a great lesson for all modern times in this close juxtaposition of two widely contrasted temperaments?

LIBERTY OF TEACHING IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

As was stated in the January number of the *Biblical World*, the trustees of Union Theological Seminary have recently voted that the professors in that institution shall not be compelled to express conformity with the Westminster Confession. The charter of the institution is one of the broadest possible in a theological seminary connected with the denomination. The recent action of the trustees was simply a return to the provisions of this charter which lays no denominational test whatsoever upon the teachers of the institution, but provides in effect that the theological instruction shall be equal to the best given in the country, and that particular attention shall be given to the teaching and discipline of the Presbyterian church.

The significance of the action of the trustees is considerable. It marks the general tendency of leading theological seminaries to grant to their faculties increased liberty in teaching. This tendency, it must be confessed, carries with it in America certain difficulties. However desirable a different condition of affairs might be, the religious life of America at present is, and for a good many years to come will be, denominational. Theological seminaries were originally established for the purpose of training men for serving a particular denomination. In the case of four or five such seminaries, and among them Union, this original purpose has been so far modified that their student body is to all intents and purposes inter-